MEMORAL

OF THE

State Temperanc Convention

HELD AT HARISBURG,

April 24th and 5th, 1879,

TO

GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF PENNSYLVANIA.

To the Honorable, the Senate and Hse of Representatives of the wealth of Pennsylvania, in gener assembly met:

The undersigned by the direction an on behalf of the State Temperance Co vention, held in the city of Harrisbur on the 24th and 25th days of April, instan respectfully represent:

THE EVILS OF INTEMPERANCE.

That intemperance and the evils, mo l, social, religious, political, educatio l, commercial, economical and pecuni y, occasioned by the use of alcoholic or intoxicating liquors in our commonwe th, in all their varied forms, and constitue ts, are and have been so uniform, univ sal and grievous, as to attract attention ex-cite apprehension, and for a half a cen ury past, have associated the efforts of good men and women for their amelioration and correction. In the earlier days of these efforts it was supposed these evils were caused by the character of the drink indulged in. Subsequently, that the evils sprang from the excess, in varied degree, of such use, and special efforts were directed for the correction of these; but for a number of years past, science, inves iga-tion and experience has demonstrated, and it is now admitted that the source of evil is in the spirit of alcohol contained in all intoxicating beverages, whether fermented, brewed or distilled. Alcohol in whatever quantity, or however combined, is a poison to human tissue. It is this noxious agent which produces the physical, mental and moral disturbance and destruction, which everywhere is witnessed as a concomitant of its use.

It is not the purpose of this paper to specially present, how this agent, manufactured and sold under authority of law, vitiates the human race, produces mental imbecility, physical debility, and premature old age, makes worthless citizens, lessens or destroys productive industry, is a chief cause of many insolvencies, bankruptcies, and losses in trade, increases taxes and lessens tax-paying ability, makes necessary the larger portion of public taxation and private charity, leads to crime and pauperism, corrupts the ballot and legislation, endangers public peace, retards and nullifies education, multiplies and sus-

tains gaming houses and b[illegible]els, makes paupers and criminals, de[illegible] justice, lessons protection to person [illegible]property, and perverts and obstructs t[illegible]bjects of all government; these and m[illegible]other of its effects are known to your hon[illegible]le body.

EARLY LEGISLATION.

This agent of evil was known [illegible]feared from the founding of the Colon[illegible] Pennsylvania. For at no time in the h[illegible]ry by the State has its manufacture [illegible]sale been free from restraint and regu[illegible]on of law as has been the manufacture [illegible]sale of furniture, cloth or clothing, b[illegible]s or shoes, grain or flour, butcher's m[illegible]fish or other articles of consumption. [illegible]our attention is called to the fact tha[illegible]the *first* legislative Assembly of the repr[illegible]en-tatives of the then Province of Pe[illegible]yl-vania, held at Chester, December, [illegible]2, and which framed the *great law* fo[illegible]e government of the Province, declared[illegible]e sale of intoxicating liquors a "cause[illegible]f nnoyance and disquiet to the people [illegible]murder among the Indians, and [illegible]nous offence to God and a reproach [illegible]blessed name of Christ and his ho[illegible]gion." From that day to this, the pe[illegible] of Pennsylvania have endeavored t[illegible] protect themselves, their property and in terests from the effects of the traffic in intoxicating liquors by laws, more numerous and varied on the principal of restraint and regulation, than upon any other question upon which legislation has been had.

NUMBER OF LICENSE LAWS.

An examination of our statutes from 1682 to the present reveals that there have been passed by the General Assembly 342 statutes in varied forms and changes to regulate the manufacture or sale of intoxicating liquors or connected therewith, The number in each decade is as follows:

1682 to 1690—2.	1780 to 1790—7.
1690 to 1700—1.	1790 to 1800—3.
1700 to 1710–13.	1800 to 1810—4.
1710 to 1720—9.	1810 to 1820—9.
1720 to 1730–13.	1820 to 1830–13.
1730 to 1740—4.	1830 to 1840—9.
1740 to 1750—1.	1840 to 1850–27.
1750 to 1760—4.	1850 to 1860–61.
1760 to 1770—1.	1860 to 1870–89.
1770 to 1780—4.	1870 to 1879–68.

To the close of the 17th century 3, in the 18th century 59, and thus far in the 19th century 280! Can any presentation of facts or argument be stronger or more convincing than the testimony of these laws against the evils which they were intended to mitigate. The continued presence of these evils is a witness of the inefficiency of legislation, for their correction, when based upon the idea that public places for their manufacture and sale is a legitimate object of government.

INEFFICIENCY OF SUCH LAWS.

It seems, therefore, to your memorialists that the constant and continued failure of license laws to accomplish any beneficial end, demands a radical change in the policy of the State on the liquor question. The safety and welfare of the people is the supreme purpose of government, the protection of life and property, the promotion of morality and industry, the development of agriculture, manufactures and commerce are the chief purposes of the assembling of the Senate and House of Representatives as the law making authority of the State. It would not be difficult to present authorities, and demonstrate by record evidence that the use of intoxicating liquors, is at all times the foe of industry and thrift, and the parent of crime and poverty, the paralyzer of manufacture and trade. It is also well established that such use in no proper sense is a promoter of good; that the user thereof has no natural demand for such use; nor is health or vigor of mind or body promoted, or life prolonged thereby; and that such use is a waste of physical, mental and material resources.

COST OF THE TRAFFIC IN PENNSYLVANIA.

Dr. Edward Young, the eminent statistician, and chief of the Bureau of Statistics [illegible] our government at Washington, as a re[illegible]lt of a quite recent investigation of the [illegible]antity and cost of liquors consumed in t[illegible] United States, derived from the re[illegible]pet of the Commissioner of Internal Rvenue states the same at $595,764,000. A[illegible]suming the population of the U. S. to be 40,000,000, and as Pennsylvania contains one-tenth of this population, which proportion is shown by the census of 1870, and that her people consume her equal share of intoxicating liquors, the annual cos[illegible] of such liquor to the people of Pennsylvania would be $59,574,000. Dr. Wm. Hargreaves, in his valuable and carefully prepared work, "*Our Wasted Resources*," compurtes the liquor bill of Pennsylvania in 1870 at $65,075,000, which was "one-third the value of the products of her agriculture, nearly one-tenth of her manu-

factures, more than two-fifths of wages paid, and about three-fourths of the receipts of her railroads." When it is considered that this cost of consumption is but one-half of the actual money value capable of computation, and that the indirect and resulting cost is equal to the direct, swelling the annual pecuniary liquor waste in Pennsylvania to more than $100,000,000, the Christian, patriot and statesman is called upon to use every legitimate method for staying this tide of waste and woe.

CRIME AND PAUPERISM.

In their report for 1871 our Board of Public Charities state: "We have spoken of intemperance as a fruitful source of pauperism and crime, and it is doubtless the proximate cause of *nine tenths* of the idleness, brutality and vice which afflict society. Government ought wisely to restrict, never to encourage this prolific evil,"

The Citizens' Association, a corporation chartered by the Legislature of Pennsylvania, and whose duty it was made to "report to your honorable bodies on the dependent and criminal population of the State, and on all matters relative to the causes of and remedies for pauperism, vagrancy and crime," in their report to the Senate and House of Representatives for 1868, state that "one-third of the insane," "one-third of the deaf mutes, one-third of the blind, and two-thirds of the friendless children" owe their sad condition to the intemperance of parents. On page 9 the report states: "It will not be doubted that *two-thirds* of the pauperism and crime of the State are justly attributable to intemperance, and it is stated by authorities that *one-third* of the dependent classes, as insane, feeble minded, etc., are to be traced to the same cause. If we apply this rule to the figures before us, we have the aggregate cost of maintaining paupers and prisoners whose condition is due to intemperance $2,204,244 per year, and the aggregate cost for maintaining the insane, idiots and other persons dependent from the same cause $55,666.66, or a total of $2,259,910.66 as the criminal and pauper tax per year caused by liquor selling. Any one who will examine the subject will find this large sum far below the actual cost. "If it costs so much to maintain the poor, helpless and vicious, who would not have been poor, helpless or vicious but for a violation of the laws of health and morality, is it not the duty of the State to provide in so far as it may for the correction and prevention of these evils? Ought we not to ask: If we have done so much for the support of pauperism and crime, what have we neglected to do for the arrest of these evils?"

"The victims of strong drink, however, come in hosts more numerous than all the rest together, and, with hopes blasted, self-respect gone, and the story of domestic sorrow and grief bearing upon the heart, point to the path of ruin that is before them and ask for help." Thirty thousand people of Pennsylvania are in this condition, and come to you with these pictures of pauperism, dependence and crime, asking that they may have a share of your sympathy, not that they may be abased and imprisoned as criminals, nor yet humiliated as paupers; but that they may have such help as will enable them to be men again, and do their portion for the public good."

REVENUE AND EXPENSE.

The number of distillers, brewers, wholesale and retail liquor dealers in Pennsylvania is about 18,000, or one for each 222 of population, or one for each 44 male adult inhabitant, and the license revenue derived from them in 1877, was $425,910. For this slight revenue, this small body of citizens hold a monopoly of this business, which we have seen involves more than $100,000,000 of waste and cost, to the people, without any enriching or enobling return. The grand jury of Dauphin county in 1873 reported to the Court their share of the license money to be $111.50, whilst they show from the county records their consequent expenditures amounted to $51,889. The revenue was only 21–100 of one per cent. of the cost of the traffic. In Lancaster county in the same year, her proportion of the license money was $335, while her expenditures for crime, pauperism, etc., caused by her liquor business were $105,194.25; the revenue was 31–100 of one per cent. of her cost of the traffic. It is believed that the experience of these counties is a fair criterion of that of the entire commonwealth.

The people of the commonwealth, smarting under these evils and becoming conscious that drink was the spring from which these bitter waters flowed aided by appeals to reason, moral and personal considerations, which by the teachings of the church, temperance societies, conventions, State and county addresses, lectures, tracts, papers and every other method

open to an enlightened philanthrophy have sought legislative aid, and the legislature in sympathy with such efforts have by no less than two hundred and forty-one enactments from and inclusive of the year 1840 to the end of 1878 endeavored to afford such relief.

THE PEOPLE DEMAND PROHIBITION.

A careful examination of the history of the temperance movement in the State, will show that the temperance sentiment has from an early period in the reform, asked the Legislature to prohibit the traffic in intoxicating drinks, or empower the citizens in counties, cities, boroughs and townships to determine by ballot whether or not liquor should be sold in such districts.

In the year 1837 the board of managers of the Pennsylvania State Temperance Society, presented a memorial to the convention for revising the constitution of the State, calling attention to the "laws of this State, respecting the licensing of houses for the retail of ardent spirits," and presenting "some reasons to your honorable body which have led our minds to the conviction that it would be desirable that a provision should be introduced into the new constitution, which would prohibit hereafter such licenses throughout the commonwealth," and concludes, "we earnestly solicit this convention to incorporate it into the constitution of Pennsylvania, that hereafter THE PATRONAGE OF THE STATE *shall never be given for the purpose of a revenue, or for any other purpose, to the traffic in ardant spirits; that it shall not be lawful in this commonwealth for public houses to distribute that destructive poison.*"

In 1840 a large State Convention presented its memorial to the legislature, stating that "the traffic in distilled and fermented liquors which now exists, under our present license laws, is the principal remaining obstacle to a reformation, promising blessings infinite in value, extending to every rank in life, and embracing every interest in humanity, most earnestly pray that the laws be so altered or amended as to give to the electors in each ward, borough or township in the State the right of determining by vote whether licenses shall be granted for retailing intoxicating liquors within their respective limits." In 1841 the State Temperance Convention, assembled at Harrisburg, in its address say: "*What then, is the legislative measure upon which there is such unanimity of opinion among the friends of temperance? It is this: The immediate passage of a law that shall put it in the power of a majority of the qualified voters in each ward, borough or township, to say whether there should be any person or persons licensed in such ward, borough or township, to sell intoxicating drinks or not.*" In October, 1846, after the legislature had authorized *eighteen counties, one borough and one township* to vote on the question of "license" or "no license" therein, in an address, the board of managers of the State Temperance Society say: "*What is the remedy?*" "*It is the enactment of a general law allowing to the voters of each district in the State the privilege of determining by ballot whether taverns shall be licensed or not.*" In December, 1847, the appeal of the Northern State Temperance Convention held at Lewisburg, Union county says: "What then, is the source from which these evils spring? It is simply THE TRAFFIC, the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors as authorized and upheld by law." "What then, is the remedy? In our opinion there is but one, and that is ENTIRE PROHIBITION."

Quotations might further be made showing an unbroken conviction, to the present time, that the evils of intemperance were caused by the traffic in liquors, and the remedy therefore to be the prohibition of such traffic.

THE PEOPLE VOTE PROHIBITON.

The Legislature passed an act approved on the seventh day of April, 1846, (Pamphlet Laws, page 248, (authorizing the qualified voters of eighteen counties, one borough and one township named therein to vote on the question of license or no license. THESE DISTRICTS SEVERALLY VOTED "NO LICENSE." The Supreme Court in the case of Parker vs. Commonwealth, 6th Barr's Rep., 507, by three of the judges against two declared the said act unconstitutional, and the people in said counties, etc., were remanded, against their will, back under a repudiated license system. The friends of temperance continuing to petition the Legislature, by an act approved April 28, 1854, submitted the abstract question of prohibition to the vote of the qualified voters. The friends of temperance in convention had asked for a prohibitor law to be enacted, and if desired, that the repeal of such law should be submitted to the vote of the people; and had declared by resolve and so published "that

no submission of the question *without law* will receive our attention, much less our sanction; *we will not vote upon it.*" The abstract question submitted without being clothed with the form of law by which the voter could judge how it would effect property or personal liberty was presented and passed mainly by those opposed to the principle of prohibition. At the taking of the vote at the annual general election in October, 1854, complicated by party questions and election for governor, the vote for governor was 371,009, while on the question of prohibition there were only 321,852 votes cast, 158,342 votes for prohibition and 163,510 against prohibition, or 49,157 less than for governor. There were then nearly 50,000 of the voters of the commonwealth that went to the polls who were indifferent on this question. Add these to the votes cast for prohibition, and its opponents failed to carry the sentiment of the state "against prohibition" by 21,995 votes. It must not be overlooked that this vote was not for political office, where a majority is a political requirement; but as the preamble to the law for submission stated, it was to "obtain a certain indication of popular sentiment." That the sentiment of the State was favorable to prohibition, was further made conclusive by the election of a Governor and a majority of Senators and Representatives at the same time favorable to prohibitory legislation and who did enact and approve such legislation by the act of April 14, 1855, P. L. 1855, p. 225.

The Hon. Eli K. Price, then a Senator from Philadelphia, in his place on April 6, 1855, in a speech in relation to this vote, said "that vote was for no other purpose than to express the popular opinion more accurately than could be done by petitions, but with no other effect. The result of that vote was that 321,775 voters of the commonwealth went to the polls; of that number 51,265 had an opportunity of voting for or against prohibition, but did not vote at all. And why didn't they? According to my interpretation, because they thought it would give a basis for an extreme liquor law, which might be proscriptive of legal rights or invasive of the constitution; hence, they withheld their votes, as I withheld mine. It may be said, they were indifferent to the result! Well, if they were indifferent to the result, then they have given their consent that we shall legislate upon the subject as we think proper; and taking to our aid the 51,265 votes with those who went for prohibition, we have a vast majority who consent to our legislating prohibitively."

The law of 1855 was repealed without re-submission to the people.

LOCAL OPTION ACT OF 1872.

By the act of March 27, 1872, P. L., p. 49, amended by act of March 6, 1873, P. L., p. 39, the qualified voters of the several counties and cities of the commonwealth were authorized every three years to vote on the question of granting license for sale of intoxicating liquors therein. Under these acts FORTY-ONE counties of the State containing 29,708 square miles of territory and 1,404,693 of a population (exclusive of cities) by a majority of 37,975 voted against license, and TWENTY-FOUR counties, containing 13,660 square miles, and 1,070,-251 of a population (exclusive of cities) by a majority of 42,475 voted for license. Seven cities containing a population of 48,794 by a majority of 2,743 voted against license. Eighteen cities, with a population of 355,617, by a majority of 19,101. voted for license. The majority against license in the entire population of the sixty-five counties (exclusive of Philadelphia) is 324,442; and of the population of the sixty-five counties and twenty-five cities of 17,619 against license. The counties in Pennsylvania voting against license contain an area of 29,708 square miles, almost equal to the territory of New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Connecticut and Rhode Island, five States containing an area of 33,272 square miles. The Local Option Law (so called) of 1872 was repealed in 1875, without re-submission or without the request of any State or county convention of the people, either political or non-political, but in the face of the remonstrance of thousands of petitioners; against the protest of the people assembled in State and county meetings, and against the provisions of the law of 1872, providing for a vote every three years.

A number of acts for localities have been passed by the Legislature, permitting counties, wards, boroughs and townships to vote on this question of License, in not one of which, so far as we are now advised, have the people voted for the continuance of license.

The following table will show these

LOCAL OPTION ENACTMENTS:

April 7, 1845, for Clearfield county.

April 1, 1846, for certain counties.
April 21, 1846, for Mifflin county.
January 22, 1847, for certain counties.
March 13, 1847, for certain counties.
March 16, 1847, for Mifflin county.
April 28, 1867, for Beaver county.
April 13, 1869, for borough of Tarentum, Allegheny county.
July 7, 1870, for Jefferson county.
May 3, 1871, for 22d Ward, Philadelphia.
March 23, 1872, for 15th " "
" " for 14th " "
" " for 13th " "
" " for 29th " "
March 5, 1872, for Shippensburg, Cumberland county.
March 27, 1872, for Commonwealth.
April 2, 1872, for Township West Deer, Allegheny county.
April 3, 1872, for 20th Ward, Philadelphia.
April 3, 1872, for 21st, Ward, Philadelphia.
April 4, 1872, Coatsville, Chester county,
January 31, 1873, for Kittanning, Armstrong county.
April 6, 1873, for Commonwealth.
April 20, 1873, West Chester, Chester county.
May 31, 1873, for St. Mary's, Elk county.

The following table will show the districts for which the Legislature passed prohibitory laws without being first submitted to a vote of the people.

LOCAL PROHIBITORY ENACTMENTS.

April 5, 1843, for certain districts in Armstrong and Clarion counties.
May 3, 1850, for Warren county.
February 18, 1851, for Washington county.
March 30, 1852, for Lancaster county on Sabbath day.
April 21, 1854, for Sand-Patch Tunnel, Somerset county.
April 28, 1854, General Law for suppression.
April 2, 1860, for Potter county (Partial).
March 27, 1866, for Blair, Indiana and Westmoreland counties.
March 27, 1866, for Beaver county, Ohio township.
March 27, 1866, for certain boroughs of Armstrong, Potter Perry and Indiana counties.
April 11, 1866, for Potter county.
April 11, 1866, for Freeport, Armstrong county.
April 11, 1866, for Blair, Indiana and Westmoreland (partial).
February 20, 1867, for Potter county.
March 9, 1867, for certain boroughs in Armstrong, Indiana and Perry counties.
March 29, 1867, for certain boroughs in Armstrong, Indiana and Perry counties.
March 14, 1867, for townships of Economy and Independence, Beaver county.
April 3, 1867, for Wyoming county.
April 17, 1867, for Allegheny township, Westmoreland county.
April 17, 1867, for certain boroughs in Armstrong and Westmoreland counties.
March 17, 1868, for townships of Industry and Green, Beaver county.
April 18, 1868, for for township Belle-Vernon, Fayette county.
March, 1869, for township Finley, Allegheny county.
April 9, 1869, for Student's N. W. Normal School.
April 9, 1869, for boroughs Conneautville and Spring, Crawford county.
April 14, 1869, for township and borough of Girard, Erie county.
April 15, 1869, for township of Patton, Allegheny county.
February 18, 1870, for borough of Fayette City, Fayette county.
April 2, 1870, for borough of Conneautville, Crawford county, and townships of Spring and Beaver, Beaver county.
April 4, 1870, for township of Franklin, Westmoreland county.
April 9, 1870, for boroughs, of Braddock, Sewickly and townships of Wilkins, Versailles, Penn, N. Fayette, S. Fayette, Sewickly, Let and Kilbuck, county of Allegheny.
April 4, 1870, for township Franklin, Westmoreland county.
March 9, 1872, for township of Carroll and borough of Monongahela, Washington county.
March 13, 1871, for certain boroughs and townships in Allegheny county.
March 13, 1872, for Washington county on election days.
March 20, 1872, for Jefferson county, township Snyder.
April 3, 872, for Henrietta Ore Mines, Woodbury township, Blair county.
April 12, 1875, for Soldiers' Encampment.

PEOPLE PREPARED FOR PROHIBITION.

We respectfully submit that the foregoing brief history of Permissive and Prohibitory legislation and the action of the people under the same, proves that a large portion of the people of Pennsylvania, if not a considerable majority of

the whole population are prepared for and desirous of the enactment of the law by your honorable bodies, which shall prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors at public legalized places for drinking purposes, or that they shall be permitted in an authoritative and solemn way, at the polls, to accept or reject a properly framed law, having this object in view. This government "is the government of the people, by the people, and for the people," and laws are for their protection and welfare, and if you, clothed with authority as their representatives and agents, in your wisdom, subject to constitutional restraints, will enact, the people will breathe into it life and power for their welfare. Of the efficiency of prohibitory liquor legislation in lessening crime, poverty and public burdens, and promoting sobriety, industry, thrift and peace, we do not here or now present the multiplied testimonies proving these results in our and other States and counties, but pray that privilege may be granted to present these to any committee to whom this memorial and accompanying bill may be referred.

Your memorialists, although convinced that the sentiment of the people of the State regards the present system of license as an entire and sad failure for beneficial ends, and desire a change in the law which will relieve them of many of the evils caused by the present system and would so declare, nevertheless, to remove all grounds for doubt, fear or objection, your memorialists respectfully present for your consideration the accompaning draft of law or bill which they most earnestly pray may be enacted into law and be called "The Temperance Law."

CONVENTION—REPRESENTATIVE.

The convention which has imposed the duty of presenting their wishes, so feebly executed and expressed in this paper, was summoned by a common desire expressed by the signatures of the chief officers of the several State Temperance Organizations and societies, officers of colleges, pastors of churches, ministers of the gospel, and men prominent in works of religion and philanthropy; and the body composed of delegates from all parts of the State, we think may be accepted as understanding and representing the temperance sentiment of the people of the State.

CHARACTER OF LAW PROPOSED.

In presenting this draft of law we believe that it expresses the desires of the people, and in their hands will execute their will, and suppress public drinking places. It also furnishes the means for detection and punishment of all violaters. The bill provides for the keeping for sale and the sale of intoxicating drinks for medicinal, sacramental and mechanical purposes, at places of convenient access, and also for the manufacture of such liquors for export or sale for proper uses. Liquors for individual or private use in a man's dwelling, or the manufacture of cider and wine for domestic use or for sale in an unfermented condition, are not forbidden or restricted. The manufacture and sale of such liquors, for drinking at places of common resort, are alone interdicted. The act goes into operation only after ninety days from a vote accepting the law, when such vote is ordered by the Court of Quarter Sessions, upon the petition of taxpayers equal to one-fourth of the voters shown by the returns, of the preceding February election. Any license for sale of liquors or place for manufacture, in districts accepting this act, are protected in their privileges until the expiration of same. We believe all interests which may be affected by a change in the present policy of the law, under this bill are carefully considered and all constitutional objections avoided.

CONSTITUTIONALITY.

"The question of the constitutionality of such (prohibitory liquor) statutes says Mr. Bishop," section 989 of his work on statutory crimes, "has been more frequently agitated than any other constitutional question presented in our tribunals." It will be found, however, that both the principles and essential features of varying laws upon this subject, have been uniformly upheld by the hightest courts, National and State, in every part of the land. See the cases collected in the United States Digest, (first series) volume 7, page 806, *et seq.* Mr. Bishop's statutory crimes (Sec. 995) says: "The State in the enactment of its laws, must exercise its judgment concerning what acts tend to corrupt the public morals, impoverish the community, disturb the public repose, injure the other public interests, or even impair the comfort of individual members over whom its protecting watch and care are required; and the power to judge of this question is necessarily reposed alone in the legislature, from whose decision no appeal can be taken directly or indirectly to any other department of the government.

When, therefore, the legislature with this exclusive authority, has exercised its right of judgment concerning this legislative question by the enactment of prohibitions, like those discussed in this chapter, all other departments of the government are bound by the decision, over which no court has jurisdiction." "Any attempt to distinguish between the power to regulate and the power to prohibit, finds no judicial support." *Pitman.*

ARGUMENT FOR FEMALES VOTING.

Your memorialists beg leave to call your attention to that clause of the submitted bill giving the privilege to females over the age of 21 equally with males to vote upon the question of the acceptance or rejection of this act. We claim this privilege, on the broad ground of citizenship, and that women are sufferers in all their affections and dearest interests from the liquor traffic, to a greater degree, perhaps, than males. They are equally interested in the general welfare, and bear a full share in the labor, care and responsibility of securing such welfare. They are citizens, amenable to the laws and entitled to their protection. This provision, is not woman's suffrage, so termed, nor, it is confidently believed, any infraction of Section 1, Article 7 of the Constitution of the State, which provides that "every male citizen 21 years of age, etc., etc., shall be entitled to vote at all elections." This 7th Article of the Constitution is a political provision, for the political necessities of the State, and applies to the power conferred for the performing the duties of continuing the government, and the enactment and administration of its laws. It is a political office for political considerations. The bill submitted is for no such purpose, within the view of the Constitution, but is a police measure simply, and the power conferred upon males and females is solely for the purpose, in the the spirit of our republican institutions, of ascertaining and determining the popular will, in a methodical and certain manner. This provision, will not do violence to public sentiment, for by Section 3, Article 10, of the Constitution, "women are eligible to any office of control or management under the school laws of this state." They are now and for years past have been the most numerous and valuable of teachers and educators. In England, women taxpayers hold and exercise the ballot at all municipal elections, and in States of this union, exercise varied political powers, and fill offices of trust. Pennsylvania will honor herself by thus honoring her mothers and sisters.

CONCLUSION.

In conclusion, gentlemen of the Senate and House of Representatives, our prayer for relief and the means of securing it, is before you. The evil in all its magnitude, turpitude and universality is known to you. The partial history of the efforts on the part of the people for its correction is feebly made known to you, and we can no more fittingly close this petition and appeal, than by the following extract from the report of the select committee of the House of Lords on intemperance, which, after investigation by testimony running through nearly three years, in their report to the present session of the Parliament of Great Britain, say:

"And when great communities deeply sensible of the miseries caused by intemperance, witnesses of the crime and pauperism which directly spring from it; conscious of the contamination to which their younger citizens are exposed; watching with anxiety the growth of female intemperance on a scale so vast, and at a rate of progression so rapid as to constitute a new reproach and a danger, believing then not only the morality of their citizens, but their commercial prosperity, is dependent upon the diminution of these evils; seeing also that all that general (license) legislation has been able to effect has been some improvement in public order, while it has been powerless to produce any perceptible decrease of intemperance, it would seem somewhat hard when such communities are willing, at their own cost and hazard, to grapple with the difficulty and undertake their own justification, that the legislature should refuse to create for them the necessary machinery, or to entrust them with the requisite power."

With the prayer for the blessing of Almighty God, this memorial is respectfully submitted.